DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 827 SP 018 082

AUTHOR	Smith, Mark
TITLE	State Associations of Colleges for Teacher Education and Institutional Change.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Special Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 81
NOTE	60p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Change Agents; *Compliance (Legal); Educational Responsibility; Federal Legislation; Governance; Higher Education; Mainstreaming; Organizational Climate; *Program Administration; Program Development; Pyramid Organization; Special Education; *Statewide Planning; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*American Association of Colleges for Teacher Educ

ABSTRACT

A network of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) state associations and liaisons was used in a project sponsored by the Office of Special Education to help the deans and directors of teacher education programs understand and meet their goals and obligations under the Education of All Handicapped Children Act and the Rehabilitation Act. Under the close coordination of the AACTE units, a national-to-state-to-institution process of change was possible. The project provided a mechanism for AACTE member institutions which had Dean's Grants to assist those schools, colleges, and departments of education without Dean's Grants. Project activities within the 54 states and territories during the three-year program included assessment, staff development, and professional collaboration. The results of an evaluation of the project showed that there was overwhelming support for the project as a model for utilizing the state associations and AACTE coordinating units at the institutional and local levels. It was perceived as a cost efficient and flexible method which, with some limitations, could be replicated with other issues and concerns in the future. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED202827

STATE ASSOCIATIONS OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

Mark Smith
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Pomeroy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, D.C. 20036

This publication was funded through a Department of Education, Office of Special Education sponsored project.

May, 1981

SP 018 082

Points of view or opinions do not necessarily represent the official views or opinions of the Office of Special Education or the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

State Associations
of Colleges for Teacher Education
and Institutional Change

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1978, AACTE embarked upon a project funded through BEH for "Institutional Capacity Building to support Public Law 94-142." It was the intent of AACTE to utilize its network of state associations coupled with its various national activities to promote change at the institutional level. This change would be directed toward the better preparation of the regular classroom teacher to meet the needs of handicapped children as mandated by Public Law 94-142.

AACTE presented a unique opportunity for promoting educational change at the institutional level through its network of 43 state associations and 11 state liaison representatives which included the fifty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam and the Virgin Islands. By closely coordinating the activities of the AACTE central office staff, the AACTE annual meeting and its various leadership conferences, with the Advisory Council of State Representatives (ACSR), the various state associations and state liaison representatives, the opportunity for a concentrated national-to-state-to-institutional process for change appeared available. The project was of interest to OSE because it provided the opportunity for reaching institutions in a more direct and involved way than any other apparent possibility. The project also provided a mechanism to stimulate institutional change in those SCDEs without Deans' Grants. It was of interest to AACTE because it afforded a chance to develop and test a process of involving schools, colleges and departments of education (SCDEs), the state associations, ACSR and AACTE in a project to promote change within the institution.

As a young part of AACTE's system of governance, the use of the state associations and ACSR in this way was of great interest and importance to AACTE.

At the end of Year I, the project had clearly involved the majority of the states and over 600 IHEs in activities aimed at raising the awareness level of the implications of P.L. 94-142 for the preparation of the regular classroom teacher.

During Year II, many state units began to look at ways of assisting its member institutions in changing the teacher preparation programs which they were currently conducting. These activities were enumerated by Liddell as follows:

> Numerous state ACTEs conducted assessments of current teacher education practices relative to preparing teachers to work with handicapped students in the least restrictive environment. The tie-in to the Deans' Grants projects continued and provided states with manpower and expertise to facilitate the change process. Other state activities included the use of steering committees, data collection and inquiries among key educators within and among IHEs in planning for change.
>
> As key educators conducted assessments and made inquiries regarding program course content, linkages were strengthened between regular and special educators, between state ACTEs and other professional organizations such as the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE), and the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). Further linkages developed as ACTEs worked with the state and local education agencies to examine pre-service teacher programs. While planning for change, association units and about half the states tapped into existing Deans' Grants projects sharing resources, expertise and consultants with other education institutions in the state.

During Year II, a National Training Workshop was held in Nashville. At this workshop, state ACTEs worked to formulate state plans of action. Upon completion, these state plans were submitted and funds requested

of AACTE. AACTE then provided the funds and staff support in order that the states might complete their activities. Year II participation included 35 states, 553 IHEs, and 1,525 individuals.

During Year III, the objective was to foster change within the teacher preparation programs for regular classroom teachers of the SCDEs. The year was to be concluded with a look at the effectiveness of the project.

II. THE ASSOCIATION, ITS NETWORK OF STATE ASSOCIATIONS AND STATE LEADERS, AND THE ADVISORY COUNCIL OF STATE REPRESENTATIVES

The formation of state units of AACTE began some thirteen years ago in Ohio. The assimilation of state units into the activity and governance structures of AACTE, however, has only taken place during the past six years.

The first state units were formed to meet the particular needs of teacher education institutions within a particular state. Although there were several motivating factors involved in the formation of the early state units, they usually came about as the teacher education institutions realized that they were in a poor bargaining position in their state when attempting to provide a parallel voice to teacher unions and other organizations in dealing with the legislature, state departments of education and similar agencies. In some states the impetus for such organization was pending legislation dealing with certification, required coursework for prospective teachers, and similar items impacting on the curriculum of SCDEs. A major factor in other states was the poor bargaining position of the teacher

education community in dealing with NEA sponsored Professional Licensure and Standards Boards. Many teacher educators objected to the proposed structure of these Boards which had only token representation from SCDEs.

Early Development: In the early stages of development of the state associations, the AACTE Board of Directors was appreciative and sympathetic to the needs being met by these state associations and gave them its blessing and encouragement in their endeavors. When invited by the state units, the president, executive director or other staff members of AACTE would attend meetings of the state associations and provide update on activities of the national association and the latest on the Washington scene.

As the state units began to take on more ambitious projects at the state level, they realized the need, in a number of instances, to solicit the assistance of the national office of AACTE for data gathering, informational access to key people who could be helpful in a particular state project, and similar types of activities. Because of these requests, an associate director of AACTE, Walter J. Mars, assumed responsibility for state unit activity within AACTE.

The Truman Pierce Report, Crises in Teacher Education: A Dynamic Response to AACTE's Future Role, summarized its position regarding state associations in the following statement:

> Within each state, institutions holding membership in the association should form a state AACTE unit. States with small numbers of member institutions could form regional rather than state organizations. These associations should provide a grassroots base for assisting each institution and improving its programs, and for providing many of the services of the association to each member institution. Membership in a state association should

include every institution preparing teachers in the state. It is assumed that any such institution would certainly wish to belong to its own national professional association. Such an association should be to their states what the national association is to the nation -- an improving program for preparing school personnel.

By the time of the AACTE Annual Meeting in 1973, state units had been formed in Ohio, Indiana, Virginia, New York, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Alabama, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona and Minnesota. The idea of forming a state unit was a topic of serious discussion in a number of other states. It was recognized by the Board of Directors of AACTE at this point, that within the not-too-distant future:

1. A large number of states would probably organize as state units,
2. The number of requests for assistance from state units to AACTE would probably increase from each state unit, and as the number of state units multiplied this was going to become an important item in terms of the function of the national office of AACTE,
3. The way in which the current states were organized, without any suggestions or direction from AACTE, would soon present a serious problem to AACTE in terms of its relationship to these units, and
4. The situation presented an opportunity for mutual benefit to both the state units and AACTE if a good working relationship could be developed.

The Board of Directors, therefore, at its Spring 1973 meeting established a State Unit Task Force to look into the development of state units and their relationship to AACTE.

First Task Force on State Units: The Task Force in its report of November 4, 1974 indicated that the national office of AACTE recognized merit in the establishment of state units for four major reasons:

1. State members needed to organize into a recognizable and working entity which could take a unified position on issues and could meet as partners or responsible adversaries with the state departments, teachers' organizations and others. Even more important, a state organization takes teacher education out of a reactionary role and provides it with the opportunity to exert positive leadership in its relationship with state departments of education, state legislatures, etc.
2. A state organization provides a vehicle for teacher education within a state to support in a unified way positions taken by the AACTE Board of Directors.
3. A state AACTE unit provides a vehicle for teacher educators within a state to effectively interact with the state legislature.
4. A state organization provides a network of communication for individual AACTE member institutions as they attempt to understand and deal with statewide issues.

The first meeting for the State Unit Task Force was in September of 1973. One of the outcomes of the State Unit Task Force was to plan and conduct a Leadership Training Institute in October 1973 which was held in Washington, D.C. Participants in this conference included the AACTE Board of Directors, the AACTE State Liaison Representatives,

officers of AACTE State Organizations which now numbered thirteen, and selected key educators. Because of the discussions held at that Leadership Training Institute and the value with which they were viewed by the participants, it was suggested that a similar opportunity should be provided at the 1974 AACTE Annual Meeting. Following the Leadership Training Institute, the State Unit Task Force identified four objectives for itself:

1. To determine how state units help the national association to be more effective in meeting the needs of state units,
2. To propose a facilitative and mutually beneficial relationship between state units and AACTE,
3. To provide the present body with information they need to understand AACTE, its structure and program,
4. To determine the process by which the state units can expand their sphere of influence as it relates to teacher education (at both the state and national level).

It should be pointed out that for a number of years the Board of Directors of AACTE had appointed a State Liaison Representative in each state who served as an official representative of AACTE to the member institutions within that state. AACTE viewed the role of the State Liaison Representative as crucial to the maintenance of a functioning two-way communications system between the national office and its member institutions. It was with this idea in mind in 1971 that AACTE drafted a statement to State Liaison Representatives with regard to their role. It indicated that during the three-year term of office, the State Liaison Representative must be "knowledgeable

about the trends, concerns and problems of teacher education in his state; familiar with the teacher education personnel and other related publics in his state; interested in expanding the membership of AACTE; and capable of assuming a leadership role for the AACTE teacher education improvement program in his state." The relationship of the State Liaison Representative to the state unit in those states where such a unit had been formed was one of the agenda items for this meeting.

In February of 1974 at the AACTE Annual Meeting in Chicago, a portion of the program was devoted to a seminar/dialogue for State Unit Officers, State Appointed Representatives and State Liaison Representatives from the various states. Discussion at this meeting revolved around several key questions. The first was what are the issues, problems, concerns, and questions relative to the development of state units. The second was what would be the value of organizing state units. The remaining four questions were a discussion of the four objectives as stated previously by the State Unit Task Force.

The general tone of the Chicago meeting was positive and it was obvious that there was real desire on the part of those people present to have both a strong state unit network as well as a strong national organization. It was their opinion that a new phenomenon was emerging within AACTE and that how this was going to evolve in order for both

state units and the national organization to be strong and supportive of each other must be addressed not only by the Board of Directors of AACTE but by representatives from the various state associations.

In June of 1974 a second Leadership Training Institute was held in Lincoln, Nebraska. The participants were of the same makeup as the first Leadership Training Institute held in Washington. Forty-four states were represented at that meeting. The general theme of the meeting was to discuss the relationship of the various state associations to each other, to the organized teaching profession, to existing political authorities, and to the national professional association. Fifty-eight resolutions were adopted by this group and forwarded to AACTE.

The following month a "Regional Conference on Cooperation in Teacher Education" was held at the University of Delaware. This meeting provided additional input for the Task Force, since the membership at this meeting included 201 teacher educators representing 50 states and 155 AACTE member institutions. The following week the AACTE State Unit Task Force met and drafted its report to the AACTE Board of Directors.

The Board of Directors of AACTE received the Task Force report at its November 1974 meeting. The Board agreed to study and consider the specific recommendations of the Task Force report at subsequent meetings of the Executive Committee and the total Board. The Board also indicated that it would respond to the Task Force in the AACTE Bulletin, thereby keeping the state units informed.

The Task Force continued to operate informally and in April of 1975 it conducted a meeting in Chicago which was attended by fifteen state leaders. Five resolutions were adopted at that meeting. Two of these resulted in a group of three state unit presidents meeting with the Board of Directors of AACTE at its May 1975 meeting to present the views of those in attendance at the Chicago meeting. Another resolution resulted in the election of Eleanor McMahon, president of the Rhode Island ACTE to the Board of Directors of AACTE as the representative of AACTE State Units. The other two motions recommended: (1) that the state units of AACTE became an integral part of the national organization in terms of membership, governance, financial and staff support, and (2) that the president of AACTE give considerations to persons for the Annual Meeting Program Committee who are well aware of issues that relate to state units.

In August 1975 a third Leadership Training Institute was held in Annapolis, Maryland. The discussions at this LTI indicated that state units were asking for immediate involvement in the governance structure of AACTE, more state-oriented benefits from AACTE, greater visibility in communications and publications of the Association, inclusion in the policy-making process, and some type of dues rebate and/or revenue sharing for state units. During this meeting, an adhoc Council of State Unit Representatives (CSUR) was organized.

Second Task Force on State Units: In November of 1975 a new Task Force, made up of the state unit representative to the AACTE Board of Directors, Eleanor McMahon, a member of the AACTE Executive

Committee, Bert Sharp, a president of one of the state associations, Mark Smith, and members from the AACTE staff met in Washington to develop principles for state (regional) unit involvement in AACTE. This Task Force believed that it was crucial for the Board of Directors to act immediately to further clarify the role of state ACTEs. There were a number of questions that needed to be addressed relative to the relationship of state units to AACTE. Examples of these were:

1. Do all AACTE member institutions in a state have to belong to the state ACTE organization to qualify for national affilitation?
2. Can non-AACTE members belong to an affilitated state ACTE?
3. Can officers of the affilitated state ACTE be elected from non-AACTE member institutions?
4. How much structure within the state associations should be dictated by the national organization (business year cycle, kinds of officers, committee structure, program components, dues structures and budgets, etc.)?

In November of 1975 the Task Force submitted a report to the Board of Directors with four major recommendations. The first had to do with a change in the process by which Board of Directors members of AACTE were elected. It was recommended that six of the twelve elected members be designated as regional representatives and voted upon by member institutions located within that region.

The remaining six members would be elected as national representatives and elected by the institutional representatives from the membership at large.

It was next recommended that an Advisory Council of State Representatives (ACSR) be established. This body was to be composed of presidents of state and regional ACTE units and State Liaison Representatives in states where there were no official state units. This body was to: (1) serve as one link in an effective communications system between the national AACTE and state units, (2) serve as the major link in an effective communication system between the various states (regional ACTE units), (3) assist the state (regional) organizations in formulating their ideas and positions regarding state and national policies, and (4) provide a means to bring to the attention of the national AACTE Board of Directors issues of concern to state (regional) organizations. It further recommended that the chairman of this group should serve as a member of the Board of Directors of AACTE.

Thirdly, it was recommended that all states and regional groups be required to adopt a standardized constitution and bylaws as condition for biennial chartering by AACTE. A recommendation for that standardized constitution and bylaws was also submitted to the Board.

The final recommendation was that a Task Force of the Board of Directors be appointed to consider the feasibility of a revenue sharing program between the national organization and its state or regional affiliates.

Formation of ACSR: At the AACTE Annual Meeting in Chicago in February of 1976, the Advisory Council of State Representatives was formally organized. This group reviewed the proposed model constitution and bylaws and made several important changes. An additional objective was added which emphasized the mutual benefit of the existance of state units for the national and state associations. It was recommended that in order to be affiliated with AACTE, a state unit must require that three-fifths of the state membership must also be members of AACTE. It was also agreed that states might elect a president from a non-AACTE member institution. However, in those cases, the state unit must elect an official AACTE representative to represent the state ACTE in the Advisory Council of the State Representatives. Lastly, it was assured that for voting purposes the number of votes of AACTE member institutions would be a simple majority in each state.

The Board of Directors of AACTE accepted the recommendations for changes in the constitution and bylaws of AACTE regarding election of members to the Board of Directors, and the acceptance of the Chairman of ACSR as a regular member of the Board of Directors. These changes were submitted to the membership and approved. The first regionally elected members to the AACTE Board of Directors were voted upon in the Fall of 1976 and assumed their places on the Board at the end of the Annual Meeting in 1977.

By the May 1977 meeting of the Executive Committee of ACSR, it had become apparent that it was time for this group to begin to define its role in more careful terms. In the past two years, the meeting

of ACSR at the Annual Meetings of AACTE had provided considerable input regarding issues which were of importance to state units. It now became necessary to take a look at which of these issues could best be addressed by ACSR, which could best be addressed by other groups within AACTE, and which ones must be delayed or left for some other group or agency to address. It was decided that it was important at this point to establish some short-term, relatively easy-to-accomplish goals which would provide visibility for the Executive Committee and the membership. In this way, credibility could be established and aid the further development of ACSR.

Development of ACSR: At the ACSR meeting during the Annual Meeting of AACTE in 1977, a motion was passed asking the AACTE Board of Directors to establish a Committee on Resolutions which would exist for the purpose of establishing official AACTE positions. The Executive Committee decided that this was one of the projects which it would pursue with the AACTE Board of Directors immediately as a type of project which would provide a valuable outcome for AACTE and at the same time furnish some visibility for ACSR. The Board of Directors accepted this idea and established an Issues and Resolutions Committee which would provide issues and resolutions for consideration at the Annual Meeting of AACTE each year. Another project which was adopted by the Executive Committee of ACSR was utilizing the offices of the Education Commission of the States to provide material relative to pending and past legislation within

the various states which affected teacher education. This material became a regular feature in Legislative Briefs, which was distributed to the membership-at-large of AACTE.

As another activity, Charles Bruning, the ACSR Chairman in 1977, conducted a Modified Delphi Study with state presidents and institutional representatives of AACTE which identified the most important issues in teacher education as viewed by these teacher educators.

The Leadership Training Institute was utilized by ACSR as a vehicle for developing ACSR and its leadership. Various LTIs were used for upgrading the understandings and skills of ACSR leaders within AACTE, providing an opportunity for extra meetings of ACSR to accomplish its program, and to improve communication between the ACSR leadership and the leadership of AACTE. In addition to the LTI held in Washington in 1977, an LTI was held in Atlanta in the spring of 1978. This particular LTI was devoted to The Role of Higher Education in Inservice Education: The Political Agenda. As was true in the LTI held in Minneapolis, this one involved not only educators but legislators from the state where the LTI was held. The ultimate theme in both instances was to involve teacher educators more actively and productively in legislation at the state level.

The ACSR Executive Committee recommended to the Board of Directors of AACTE that in 1978 an LTI be sponsored by AACTE which would bring together the leadership of ACSR and the leadership of AACTE (the Board of Directors and the major commissions) in a two-to-three day conference to discuss mutual concerns, problems and possible

solutions. The Board of Directors accepted this idea and the first such conference was held on the campus of the Lindenwood Colleges in St. Charles, Missouri in June of 1978. In June of 1979, a similar conference was held at Wingspread, Wisconsin. The first such conference in Lindenwood was a very important conference in the sense that it accomplished the purpose of securing understanding and cooperation between the leadership of AACTE and the leadership of ACSR for common goals.

ACSR continued to sponsor LTIs for its leadership in conjunction with activities conducted by AACTE. In December of 1977, an LTI in Washington, D.C. was geared at implementing the new multi-cultural standards of NCATE. In January of 1979, an LTI was held in St. Louis which was a part of the AACTE/OSE Project on Education of the Handicapped. Forty-four state leaders attended this conference.

ACSR has utilized a number of resources in order to accomplish its tasks. Legislative Briefs which has been mentioned previously, has been utilized for this purpose. Articles in Legislative Briefs have been related for the most part, to substantive issues regarding legislation and state department activities of the various states. STATEments has been used as a newsletter for state leaders. This particular publication was designed primarily for highlighting the activities of ACSR.

The other resources, which have already been mentioned, are LTIs, the meetings of ACSR which precede the AACTE Annual Meeting each year, and the activities which grow out of the three ACSR Executive Committee Meetings which are held annually.

The staff of AACTE has prepared several publications which have been of use to ACSR leadership and helpful in communicating the activities of this organization. A State Officers Handbook: Your Role and ACSR, is such a publication and is provided for each new state president as he/she assumes office. Another publication which was developed by the central office staff and various members of ACSR was State Associations of Colleges for Teacher Education and Public Policy. This publication devoted itself to how state units might become more active in political action and public policy development.

Throughout the development of state units and ACSR, several items continued to surface. The first is the development of the state unit as a viable and important voice for teacher education in the legislative arena as well as within the group of professional associations of the state. The second is the relationship of ACSR to AACTE as a vehicle for strengthening both organizations. The development of the state associations and ACSR has been a movement of significant and far-reaching importance in the life of AACTE.

III. THE AACTE/OSE PROJECT

Statement of the Problem: With this network of state associations and ACSR, the AACTE thus embarked upon the AACTE/OSE Project. The original proposal contained the following statement of the problem:

> The enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142) and the implementation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-112) are having significant impact upon schools, colleges and departments of education (SCDE). They are endeavoring

to comply with these mandates but many of the nation's 1,326 SCDEs lack the information necessary to be responsive. While they want to redesign their programs to accommodate the "mainstreaming," "barrier free" and "individualized education" concepts inherent in these laws, they lack necessary advice and incentive.

As you well know, schools and colleges of education have taken the lead both in the preparation of special education personnel and in research about special education related problems. Recently enacted laws and regulations place an added burden upon schools and colleges of education:

> The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-112, Section 504) has mandated that no otherwise qualified person, by virtue of being handicapped, shall be denied access to educational programs or employment in institutions receiving funds by virtue of being handicapped.

Deans and directors of schools, colleges and departments of education need training and information regarding the implications of Section 504 requirements on the total range of programs they offer. Of particular importance are the implications of site selection for student teaching and off-campus inservice programs.

The Education Amendments of 1973 (P.L. 93-380) provides due process and procedural safeguards for handicapped students whose educational rights have been infringed.

Deans and directors of schools, colleges and departments of education require access to information regarding their obligations relative to the recruitment, admission and retention of handicapped higher education students into programs of professional teacher preparation. They also need to understand the importance of including such information in the training programs for all school personnel.

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) provides that every handicapped child is entitled to free, appropriate public education.

Deans and directors of schools, colleges and departments of education require access to information regarding the implications of P.L. 94-142 upon their programs, e.g., how they can create and organize new interdisciplinary preservice programs which are responsive to the "least restrictive environment" provisions of the Act.

Such information already exists, because the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) has facilitated program redesign and reorganization through the awarding of a number of "Deans' Grants" to select SCDEs. The grants have assisted some eighty SCDEs to effect changes in their inservice and preservice programs. While the CFDA 13.451 clearly indicates that a few additional Deans' Grants will be made in FY 1978, limited BEH resources make it impossible for each of the 1,326 deans and directors of SCDEs to receive such funds. What is needed, therefore, is a cost effective way for BEH to impact upon the other 1,235 deans and directors. While some eighty SCDEs have had considerable experience in creating programs responsive to Section 504 and P.L. 94-142, a significantly larger number have not had those resources; consequently, many have not embarked upon the changes mandated by the laws. An information exchange must be created between the Deans' Grants recipients and the balance of the nation's 1,326 SCDEs.

We are suggesting that deans and directors of teacher education programs in IHEs without Deans' Grants are also in need of staff development or inservice training to enable them to meet the physical, instructional and service requirements of both the Education of All Handicapped Children Act and the Rehabilitation Act. Such training will foster the infusion of new learning concepts and strategies into their SCDE programs for both regular and special education personnel. Deans and directors need to be able to draw upon the experiences of the Deans' Grants recipients -- through direct exchanges of information, through technical assistance and through stimulation.

Objectives: Again turning to the original proposal, AACTE listed objectives for the project as follows:

Since the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) is an institution-based national association, involving the total spectrum of college and university personnel; it is called upon for assistance in interpreting new roles and planning new activities for entire SCDEs. With the assistance of BEH, AACTE can stimulate the creation of an information exchange between Deans' Grants SCDEs and the rest of the nation's SCDEs which would enable the latter schools and colleges of education to fulfill their responsibilities and obligations.

AACTE believes that such an information exchange or training program can be accomplished in a highly cost-effective manner because of the existence of two important structures:

- A network of State Associations of Colleges for Teacher Education (ACTE) units is in existence. Regular meetings of deans and directors are held two, three, four or more times each year.

- The BEH-sponsored Deans' Grants projects are funded and on-going. The deans and directors of these sixty-five projects are experimenting with responses to Section 504 by providing training programs for educators to accommodate the mandates of P.L. 94-142.

We are convinced that if an interface can be created between these two important structures or systems we can accomplish our modest goal of helping deans and directors understand their obligations and the opportunities for change these federal actions offer. The objectives will be:

1. To draw upon the current efforts of Deans' Grants SCDEs to retrain and/or prepare school personnel for the effective implementation of P.L. 94-142

2. To identify similar efforts by non-Deans' Grants SCDEs for purposes of matching them with the needs and capabilities of other SCDEs

3. To facilitate the selection, adaption and/or replication of such efforts by other SCDEs through an information exchange strategy

4. To utilize the existing AACTE state program as a dissemination and training effort to assist all SCDEs in fulfilling the requirements of the Acts

Expected Outcomes: Implementation of this proposal during its year of OSE support will yield the following outcomes:

1. National training institute for AACTE State Presidents and State Liaison Representatives, the AACTE Board of Directors and other key personnel

2. The publication of an issue of the Journal of Teacher Education focusing on the responsibilities of teacher education administrators and faculty arising from the federal legislation

3. A small amount of "seed money" for each of the thirty-seven state ACTE units to bring to their meetings consultants (along with Deans' Grants recipients) for technical assistance

4. Session at the 1979 AACTE Annual Meeting focusing on The Education of All Handicapped Children Act

5. State leadership training institutes

In essence, we are proposing that AACTE serve as a link between the Deans' Grants recipients (and through them, BEH) and the AACTE deans and directors of schools and colleges of education. Virtually every dean or director is involved in his/her state ACTE unit and/or attends the AACTE Annual Meeting. Consequently, if we affect the content and program of those meetings we can reach our intended audience with information they need.

The continuation proposal submitted the following year proposed the continuation of:

1. Utilizing the network of approximately 40 AACTE state associations as the chief mechanism for providing training opportunities and disseminating training materials;

2. Providing a bridge between non-Deans' Grants institutions and Deans' Grants institutions by capitalizing on the experience of the latter to provide inputs into the training activities of this project;

3. Maintaining strong ties with Maynard Reynold's National Support System Project (NSSP) which provides technical assistance to the Deans' Grants projects, and working jointly with NSSP in these ways:

    a. the activities of both NSSP and the AACTE project for years two and three will be planned in relation to a common conceptual framework which proposes that the primary focus of NSSP should be on *development*, while that of the AACTE project on *training and dissemination*;

    b. pertinent products generated by NSSP will be utilized in the training activities of this project and information about NSSP products will be disseminated to non-Deans' Grants institutions; and

    c. feedback to NSSP about existing and needed training materials will be provided from the AACTE project.

By the third year of the project, the overall goal had been succinctly stated as the stimulation of "institutional change in response to P.L. 94-142 in AACTE member institutions that do not have Deans' Grants by:

a. raising levels of awareness about and commitment to the basic concepts of the federal legislation,

b. stimulating appropriate changes in the preservice teacher education programs, and

c. institutionalization of those changes.

Activities: The activities of the project were aimed at the 677 AACTE member colleges and universities which did not have Deans' Grants to assist them in responding to P.L. 94-142. These institutions were to be reached through the network of 43 ACTE state associations and 54 state and territorial leaders. It was proposed that activities to be utilized through the state association network were: training opportunities, dissemination of training materials, and the provision of technical support. It was anticipated that this approach would provide a multiplier-effect in assisting institutions to respond to P.L. 94-142.

To facilitate this process and to provide close coordination between the state associations and the staff of the AACTE/OSE project, three main linkages were established:

1. The chairperson of ACSR served on the project's advisory council,

2. The Executive Committee of ACSR was involved directly in the activities of the project,

3. The staff person who coordinated ACSR's activities within the AACTE central office served part-time on the staff of the AACTE/OSE staff.

The main activities of the project included: (1) Leadership Training Institutes, (2) encouraging and supporting programs, institutes and workshops by the various state associations, (3) encouraging strong cooperative efforts between the state associations and the National Support Systems Project (NSSP), and (4) to utilize AACTE as a support system for those institutions that do not have Deans' Grants. The involvement of the chairperson of ACSR on the AACTE/OSE project committee was an important linkage for insuring that the involvement of the state associations and ACSR would be in the most efficient and reasonable manner. The utilization of the Executive Committee of ACSR in the project assured that this project would have a high priority within the various activities conducted by ACSR. The involvement of the AACTE staff person within the staff structure of the AACTE/OSE project assured the smooth functioning of the linkage between the project and ACSR and the state associations.

Nature of Training Provided: The initial Leadership Training Institute conducted in St. Louis in January of 1979 was designed:

1. To raise the level of awareness of:

    a. the state leaders in terms of the implicationssof P.L. 94-142 for the teacher preparation programs for regular classroom teachers,

    b. some of the programs which have been operating under Deans' Grants to include both their successes and those areas in which difficulty was encountered,

    c. the availability of materials and assistance from NSSP and AACTE project offices

2. To plan possible activities to be conducted by the various state associations as a follow-up of this LTI to accomplish similar objectives at the state level, and

3. To begin formulating plans for the use of a modest sum which could be used by each state in conducting the activities listed in #2 above.

Resources Provided: Training Materials, Resource Personnel:

The following resources were provided state associations:

1. Training and resource materials, 31 titles from AACTE, 7 from NSSP, and 10 from Project HEATH.
2. Maynard Erickson and several of the regional liaison persons were used as resource persons to state associations in 15-20 instances.
3. Karl Massanari, Diane Merchant and Penny Early of the AACTE/OSE project staff provided enumerable services and assistance.

State Activities: Participation: During the first year of the project, the following activities were conducted:

1. The St. Louis LTI workshop in January of 1979 participation: 49 states, 65 IHEs, and 70 individuals.

2. Thirty-four state AACTE meetings on P.L. 94-142 participation: 44 states, 111 IHEs, and 1,350 individuals.

The activities of Year II included an LTI in Nashville which involved 42 states, 60 IHEs, and 66 individuals. Here the states formulated a plan of action and ultimately submitted it to AACTE for funds. Participation for Year II involved 35 states, 553 IHEs, and 1,525 individuals.

Year III included the following activities:

1. Submission of a state plan request for funds,

2. The use of the AACTE Annual Meeting to report on these activities and to review the use of the state association as a vehicle for change,

3. Development of state blueprint,

4. Submission of state blueprint, and

5. Synthesis of state blueprint

Participation: 26 states, 460 IHEs, and 1,000 individuals.

Careful perusal of Chart B in Liddell's report would indicate that a large and varied number of activities took place within the states participating in this project. She has summarized these activities within that report as follows:

1. Assessment Activities

   a. to determine the skills and knowledge needed for working with handicapped students in regular classrooms, and

   b. to analyze current state efforts related to education of the handicapped and improving personnel preparation programs.

2. Staff Development Activities

   a. to raise levels of awareness about and commitment to the educational concepts in P.L. 94-142,

   b. to provide information about what is happening in Deans' Grants projects,

   c. to explore the kinds of competencies needed by regular teachers to work effectively with handicapped students,

   d. to determine how to modify present teacher education programs, and

   e. to explore new roles for regular and special teacher educators.

3. Professional Collaboration Activities

   a. with other state groups engaged in related programs and projects,

   b. with Deans' Grants projects,

c. with the National Support Systems Project which provides technical assistance to Deans' Grants projects,

d. with state departments of education, and

e. with other AACTE state associations.

State Activities: Products: Again referring to the Liddell report, it is obvious that a number of identifiable products have resulted from this project. These are listed primarily as:

1. SCDE's representation on the state committees responsible for designing the comprehensive system of personnel development (SPD),

2. The assembling and distribution of state resources on P.L. 94-142,

3. The distribution of Deans' Grants materials to non-Deans' Grants institutions,

4. Cooperative and collaborative efforts between SCDEs and LEAs and SEAs to meet the mandate of P.L. 94-142.

The five case studies in the Liddell report furnish considerable information regarding the kind of activity which was generated by this project. These will be referred to again in a later section.

V. RESEARCH ON THE USE OF STATE ASSOCIATIONS AS VEHICLES FOR CHANGE WITHIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

A review of the literature fails to turn up any previous effort to evaluate the use of an organization such as the state Association of Colleges for Teacher Education as a vehicle for change within the curriculum of local institutions of higher education. There have been some studies which deal with this problem in a tangential way which might be of interest. For example, some evaluation has been

done by national associations in looking at the effect of the national arm of the association in terms of influence on legislation at the national level and change within its individual members.

The National Council for the Social Studies collaborated with the Civil Liberties Education Foundation beginning in 1962 in a program to improve the teaching of the Bill of Rights. In evaluating this program in 1978, they concluded that the number of law-related programs in the public schools had grown from around 100 in 1971 to over 300 in 1978. They further concluded that while there were few law materials available to the schools in 1971, there were over 1,500 such items in 1978. They summarized the effort: "The law-focused education movement of the 1960s and 1970s has brought an exciting curriculum innovation and change which provides the secondary schools, in particular, with the means to achieve one of its most important goals, education for responsive citizenship." (Morrison 1979)

The National Education Association has conducted several studies to determine the effectiveness of its state and local affilitates as agents for changing conditions of teacher welfare within the local school district. The Association has also studied the effect of the local educational agency as a change agent through negotiating contracts with school boards which effect changes in instruction in the local classroom. (National Education Association 1973)

Allen has studied the historical development of regional speech communication associations and their influence on the teaching of speech communication in elementary and secondary schools. He concluded

that while the effect "has not been that pronounced on such change, there are opportunities for future advancement in the field in the future." (Allen 1980)

Kapur studied the effects of the National Council of Education, Research and Training, the Central Board of the Secretary of Education, the Indian Schools Council, and professional organizations of teachers on changes in mathematics education in India. (Kapur 1978)

The failure of a medical care organization to effect desired changes in intern resident education was studied by Bucher. He concluded that the mechanism was a feasible one, in spite of its failure to succeed in the situation studied. (Bucher 1975)

The American Educational Research Association studied the form of sociological contributions to and the role of sociologists in policy formulation on the principal outside agents affecting its field. While concluding that sociology played a role in making recommendations to colleagues and policymakers, and in making decisions on matters brought before the AERA, the impact of the group was not deemed to be as great as those within it felt it should be. (Lazarsfeld 1975)

The Consortium of Professional Associations for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs conducted the Grove Park Institute in 1969 to look at the influence of professional associations on higher education, teaching and the education of teachers. (Vogt 1969)

Perhaps the closest study to one of this type was conducted by the American Association of School Administrators. The AASA was interested in assessing the impact of its drive-in conferences and similar activities for promoting change within local school districts.

A questionnaire was used in which superintendents who attended the drive-in conferences were asked about the effectiveness of these conferences as a way of providing useful information to superintendents. (AASA 1971)

None of these studies dealt, however, with the issue of the utilization of a state arm of a national association as a way of producing change within institutions of higher education. Furthermore, the methods used for looking at changes which might be attributed to a national association in these studies, provided little help in a methodology for evaluating the use of a state association in producing such change.

Method of Evaluation of the AACTE/OSE Project: Having found little in the literature to guide the direction of the evaluation for this project, it was decided that a combination questionnaire/ interview study would be done in an attempt to determine the effectiveness of state associations as change agents within IHEs. It was decided that the questionnaire would be developed from the approach of first listing the "best of all worlds." In other words, the question was addressed, "What could have happened from a project of this type?" From this, a series of questions were developed which addressed the areas of process, products and outcomes, each from the standpoint of institutions of higher education, state associations and changes within the state.

The questionnaire was developed by the researcher and then circulated among the staff members of the project and the AACTE central office, and among colleagues at his own institution. The

recommended changes were incorporated into the final questionnaire which was printed and distributed by the AACTE staff person working with state associations, Penny Earley. Each state was asked to respond to the questionnaire and return it to the AACTE central office. A follow-up letter urged those state associations that had not responded previously to return the questionnaire in order that it might be included in the evaluation process. The results of the questionnaire were compiled and summarized.

It was decided that a more in-depth look at several associations on the extremes of the continuum of involvement in this project would be of value. Five state associations which had been minimally involved in the project were selected and the presidents of those associations were interviewed during the AACTE Annual Meeting in Detroit in 1981. The purpose of these interviews was to determine why these state associations had not become more involved in the AACTE/OSE project.

Similarily, five associations were selected which had been extensively involved in activities within their state and within the institutions in their state as a result of this project. Presidents of those associations were interviewed at the LTI held in Washington, D.C. in March of 1981. In this instance, the purpose was to determine why these associations had become so deeply involved in the activity as a result of this project.

In addition, at the AACTE Annual Meeting in Detroit in 1981 a Vanguard Session was held with members of the state associations. At this session, Marian Beth Liddell summarized the monograph,

AACTE State Associations and Public Law 94-142. Mark Smith then followed with a brief discussion of the findings of the questionnaire study to date and asked for input from those present regarding: ways in which the project had been particularly effective in their states, and ways in which the project could have been more effective had certain changes been incorporated. The nature of those changes was discussed.

The results of the questionnaire and the three types of interview and open discussion activities were then synthesized to provide the evaluation for this project.

VI. RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The Questionnaire: Questionnaires were returned from 26 of the states and territories. This is 48% of the possible 54 which could have been returned. A part of the data has been presented in Tables I-XII.

The first section of the questionnaire contained general questions and was to be answered by all state ACTE presidents and state liaison representatives. The first question was, "How long have you or your state group participated in the AACTE Project on the Education of the Handicapped?" Almost all of the respondents indicated that they had participated, only two indicating no participation. Half (13) had participated in Year I, 85% (22) had participated in Year II, and 69% (18) had participated in Year III. This information is included in Table I.

TABLE I

LENGTH OF PARTICIPATION BY STATE ASSOCIATIONS

No. of State Associations	YEAR I	YEAR II	YEAR III	NO PARTICIPATION
	13	22	18	2
%	50	85	69	8

The second question asked, "If you or your state AACTE decided not to participate in project activities in one or more years, please indicate the reason for this decision." Since of those who returned the questionnaire almost all participated, there were few answers to this question. Those who did not participate indicated that "poor communication" and "not being aware of the project" were the greatest problems. One indicated that his state was meeting or exceeding the goals of the project without AACTE support. Additional comments included, "The state association was disorganized during the earlier years," "We are planning to apply in 1981," and "The first task was to organize a state organization."

The second section of the questionnaire was devoted to responses from presidents of state associations or state liaison representatives from states which had participated in the project. The questions were to be answered in the light of changes which had occurred during the last three years or subsequent to the state's participation in the AACTE/Office of Special Education Project, in preservice special education training or preservice preparation of regular teachers for mainstream classrooms. Question three asked, "Have changes been incorporated in the requirement for the certification

of teachers in your state?" The answers are presented in Table II.

TABLE II

CHANGES IN TEACHER CERTIFICATION

	YES	DISCUSSED	PENDING	NO ACTION
No. of State Associations	11	6	3	6
%	42	23	11	23

Over half indicated in the affirmative or that such action was pending. Of those associations indicating changes had been made or considered, 58% (15) indicated that changes were to affect regular teachers, 35% (9) indicated that they were to affect teachers and administrators and 27% (7) were to affect special education teachers. Table III presents this data.

TABLE III

PROFESSIONALS AFFECTED BY CHANGES

	REGULAR TEACHERS	SPECIAL ED. TEACHERS	TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS
No. of State Associations	15	7	9
%	58	27	35

To the question, "Has legislation been enacted effecting teacher preparation in your state?", the majority, 54% (14), indicated in the negative. The responses to this question are presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV

LEGISLATION ENACTED AFFECTING TEACHER PREP

	YES	INTRODUCED BUT NOT ENACTED	NO
No. of State Associations	8	2	14
%	31	8	54

To the question, "If legislation has been enacted or considered, would it affect regular teachers?", 35% (9) indicated in the affirmative. Such legislation would affect teachers and administrators in 19% (5) of the cases and 11% (3) would have affected special education teachers only. This data is presented in Table V.

TABLE V

PROFESSIONALS AFFECTED BY ENACTED OR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

	REGULAR TEACHERS	SPECIAL ED. TEACHERS	TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS
No. of State Associations	9	3	5
%	35	11	19

The next question was, "Have any other administrative or non-legislative actions been taken which impact on teacher preparation?" Only three states responded. One commented upon legislation within the state which had preceeded P.L. 94-142. Another indicated, "Certification office changed requirements -- added course to the curriculum." A third state said, "The Division of Elementary and

Secondary Education of the state has demanded that components for the exceptional student be incorporated into each teacher education program. Standards have been identified for the self-study and on-site visit."

Question six asked, "Have members of your state ACTE or the State Department of Education developed stronger standards with regard to school personnel preparation?" Fifty percent (13) indicated "no" as far as the state ACTE was concerned, while 23% (6) indicated "yes." As for the State Department of Education, almost an even split occurred with 42% (11) indicating "no" and 38% (10) indicating "yes." See Table VI for this information.

TABLE VI

STRONGER STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL PERSONNEL PREPARATION

	STATE ACTE		STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
No. of State Associations	6	13	10	11
%	23	50	38	42

"Approximately how many schools, colleges and departments of education in your state have modified their personnel preparation programs relative to education of the handicapped and how many SCDEs are in your state?", was the next question. This was a very difficult question to compile because of the types of answers which were given.

However, converting the sixteen usable answers to percentages, ten of these states indicated that all of the SCDEs in their state have modified their programs accordingly. In the other states, one state indicated 92%; two states between 60 and 70%; one state 50%; one state between 30 and 40%; and the remaining state just over 10%.

Question eight again proved to be difficult to tabulate. The question, "Overall, what do you assess as the degree of change among SCDEs in your state? Please estimate the number of SCDEs for each of the following," provided four degrees of change. More than half of the respondents did not know how to estimate the answer to this question. Of those that did answer the question, the numbers were converted to percentages of the institutions in the state and the data tabulated in Table VII.

TABLE VII

DEGREE OF CHANGE AMONG SCDES IN EACH STATE

	LESS THAN 10%	10-25%	25-35%	35-45%	45-55%	55-65%	65-75%	75-85%	100%
No Observable Change	2			2			1		
Minimal	1		3		4	1	1		
Moderate	2		3		2				
Significant	2	2							1

To question number nine, "To the best of your knowledge, how many institutions in your state have applied for OSE Deans' Grants,"

apparently 67 such institutions have applied. In response to the question, "How many have received Deans' Grants," the number was 59.

Respondents were next asked, "To what extent has the AACTE/OSE project effected the cooperative ventures among SCDEs in your state?" Most indicated "very little" or "to some extent," with 31% indicating the latter and 27% indicating the former. See Table VIII for further information.

TABLE VIII

EFFECT ON COOPERATIVE VENTURES AMONG SCDES IN STATE

	NOT AT ALL	VERY LITTLE	TO SOME EXTENT	SIGNIFICANTLY
No. of State Associations	1	7	8	4
%	4	27	31	15

In response to question twelve, "How would you evaluate the material and technical support connected with the AACTE/OSE project?", Table IX indicates a wide spread over the entire range from "weak" to "excellent." Only one respondent found any of the materials "very poor" and the majority of the respondents indicated that the material and technical support had been "good" or "very good."

Question thirteen asked, "Please answer the following question assuming that you were helping to plan such a project, were it to be done over again." Then followed several questions, the answers to which were given as follows. With regard to the state's expectations, half (13) said they were "about right," whereas 31% (8) indicated their expectations were "too high." With regard to the expectations of AACTE, 42% (11) indicated that AACTE's expectations were "too

TABLE IX

EVALUATION OF MATERIAL AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT

	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	ADEQUATE	WEAK	VERY POOR
material dissem.	3	5	10	3	2	0
state resource book	2	9	2	3	1	1
communication & support from AACTE office	4	7	6	4	1	0
NSSP materials	4	4	6	1	5	0
NSSP liaison reps.	1	4	4	3	7	0
individual staff support	4	3	6	5	1	0

high," and 38% (10) indicated the expectations were "about right." These data are included in Table X. Thirty-eight percent (10) indicated they could have accomplished more with more money, whereas 23% (6) indicated the expectations should have been smaller. A number of respondents found it difficult to respond to either of these suggestions.

TABLE X

EVALUATION OF PROJECT PLANNING

		TOO HIGH	TOO LOW	ABOUT RIGHT
State Expectations	#	8	1	13
	%	31	4	50
AACTE Expectations	#	11	2	10
	%	42	8	38

With regard to the question, "Would you recommend closer coordination/linkages with the state-based or state-focused national groups such as NASDTEC, NASDSE, and NASBE?", 62% (16) indicated in the affirmative and 15% (4) indicated in the negative. Of those who responded affirmatively, 27% (7) indicated both state and national coordination, 23% (6) indicated national coordination, and 15% (4) indicated state coordination. In responding to, "Should a greater effort be directed to regional efforts of AACTE with state associations?", 58% indicated in the affirmative and 27% indicated in the negative.

Question fourteen asked, "How would you evaluate AACTE's efforts in behalf of implementation of P.L. 94-142?" Most of the responses were in the "strong" to "very strong" range on this question, with 69% voicing these two categories. The responses to this question and the two to follow are given in Table XI. Question fifteen asked, "How would you evaluate ASCR's efforts in behalf of the implementation of P.L. 94-142?" Sixty-nine percent again answered either "strong" or "very strong." Question sixteen asked, "How would you evaluate

TABLE XI

EVALUATION OF EFFORT

		VERY WEAK	WEAK	MODERATE	STRONG	VERY STRONG
AACTE	#	0	1	6	11	7
	%	0	4	23	42	27
ACSR	#	0	1	6	13	5
	%	0	4	23	50	19
STATE ASSN.	#	0	4	10	9	1
	%	0	15	38	35	4

your state unit's efforts in behalf of the implementation of P.L. 94-142?" Most of the respondents indicated "moderate" to "strong" for this answer, with 38% indicating the former and 35% indicating the latter.

The third section of the questionnaire was to be completed by state liaison representatives. The first question -- question #17 -- asked, "Do you feel not having a state association in any way hampered the AACTE/OSE project efforts conducted in your state?" Five of the eight respondents indicated in the negative and the other three indicated in the affirmative.

To question eighteen, "Has participation in this project stimulated interest in forming an AACTE state association?", three indicated in the negative, two responded in the affirmative, and one indicated "to some extent."

The fourth and final section of the questionnaire was directed toward state association presidents. Question nineteen asked, "If your state association is less than three years old, did this project

play an important part in its development toward becoming a state affilitate?" Four states indicated that it had not. One state indicated that it had, and two indicated that it had "to some extent." The state that indicated "yes" commented that, "Without this project, the unit would have come because of our new regulations and our need to help one another, but we would have missed this vital area of concern."

Question twenty asked, "How would you evaluate the project's effect upon the state association?" Forty-six percent (12) of the respondents said that it served to strengthen the association, while 27% (7) said that it made no difference. Question twenty-one asked, "During the past three years, approximately how many of your state association meetings included topics related to personnel preparation and education of the handicapped?" Not all of the respondents answered this question. A summation of those that did would indicate that there were forty such meetings devoted to the topic during the past three years.

Question twenty-two asked, "What support resources or activities important to your state association were forgotten or missed in the planning or execution of this project?" Most of the respondents either indicated "none" or did not respond to this question. Six respondents did, however, comment. These comments were as follows:

> "Follow-up of implementation."
>
> "I've been running to keep up with the support and activities provided."

"At the time of this project, our association was just 'born.' We were organizationally neophytes; we did not have the support of a developed state organization."

"Mailings of materials or descriptions of materials to individual SCDEs."

"The task is just so big, we need more money, people and other support efforts."

"I see that a statewide committee would have helped hold the project together better; that a political advocate would have helped our efforts --- people are saturated with programs on the handicapped, even though there is much to be done!"

Respondents were then asked, "From the standpoint of effecting changes in SCDEs, does the direct involvement of state associations appear to be an effective mechanism for conducting national AACTE projects?" All of those who responded to this question indicated either "yes" or "to some extent" and were almost evenly split on these two responses. Forty-two percent (11) indicated "yes" and 35% (9) indicated "to some extent."

Question twenty-four asked, "What are the major advantages of involving state associations in the conduct of national AACTE projects?" Twenty of the respondents addressed this question. Twelve of these listed "involvement or improving involvement between the state association and the national association and among state units" as one of the major advantages. They included such phrases as "the importance of grassroots involvement," "won't work without them," "the state association is closer to the schools and promotes direct involvement; this also encourages commitment to the project as they feel a need to support their state," "a shared responsibility; more people are active," and "closer contact brings more activity."

Five of the respondents indicated communication was a major advantage. They indicated such things as "talking together and sharing resources," "this is the best means of communication and dissimination," "focal point for dissiminating material, announcements, programs and so forth" and "keeping the topic 'up front' and providing more widespread information." Three of the respondents indicated "strengthening the role of the association." They made such comments as "strengthened the role of the state association, but here the scope and money were too small for a good result." A second comment was, "generates a sense of power and visibility as an educational force in the state," and a third was, "helps strengthen its role in the state and brings the association to the attention of non-members."

Question twenty-five asked, "What are the major problems or disadvantages in doing so?" Fifteen of the states responded to this question. There was not a predominant answer to this question. A few states responded "none." Several states indicated "the problem of differing priorities within the institutions of the state." Three indicated "the problem of communication." Two states indicated that "the project was too large for the amount of money available." Two states indicated that "the major problem was time." "The small size of units" was indicated by one state. Another state said "institutional jealousies, dominated by special education from some institutions," was a problem. Another stated that "the leadership has to be strong which may not always prevail.

It takes the commitment of two or three campuses to make things go." Another state indicated "developing a sense of ownership in issues that are secondary to 'survival at home'; we are burdened with state standards and reviews that sap our time and energy. Other projects are not a #1 priority."

Question twenty-six asked, "What is the one major recommendation you would make to AACTE which if implemented would have improved the administration of the OSE project?" Fourteen state associations responded to this question. Four of them indicated that "greater and earlier involvement of the states in the actual development and planning of the project would have been an improvement." Two indicated "greater promptness with regard to sending money." One suggested "more money and more lead time." The other responses were as follows: "The Deans' Grants projects all viewed the AACTE/OSE project as infringing upon their turf...it took a great deal of persuasion to win them over," "IHEs are not rewarded for cooperation," "faculty efforts are rewarded on an individual basis," and "the competitive nature of our business is counter-productive." Other comments were "regional meetings/ efforts may be more effective than state efforts," "a set of goals that would focus energies of membership related to Deans' Grants," "more activities in Washington," "I think we've come a long way, relatively speaking, in a short time. I have no suggestions," "mailings to all state institutions telling them of materials available at state and national headquarters," "include field workers to travel to states," and "too little effort for such a large task."

Question twenty-seven asked, "In general, how valuable do you believe your state ACTE's participation in this project was?" The general response to this question was in the area of "moderately valuable" or "valuable," for "your state ACTE members," "the SCDEs in your state," and "the national AACTE." Eighty-five percent of the respondents indicated for their state ACTE members it was "moderately valuable," "valuable," or "very valuable." Ninety-five percent answered the same way for SCDEs in their state, and 85% answered the same way for the national AACTE. This data is included in Table XII.

TABLE XII

STATE ASSOCIATION PARTICIPATION

	VERY VALUABLE	VALUABLE	MODERATELY VALUABLE	VALUABLE TO A SMALL DEGREE	NOT VALUABLE
State ACTE Members	3	6	9	2	0
SCDEs in the State	1	6	6	7	0
AACTE	2	7	6	4	1

Interviews with Officers of State Associations Minimally Involved: In an effort to determine why some state associations were either very minimally, or not involved at all in the project, five state associations which fell in this category were contacted and their presidents or Program Coordinators were interviewed. The president or Program

Coordinator was asked to evaluate why the state associations had not been more involved and in what way the project could have been improved so there would have been more involvement. In the case of State A, this state had had two institutes relative to P.L. 94-142 prior to the time of the initiation of the AACTE/OSE project. By the time this project started, special education had a high priority in that state. Thus, the project was not needed in order to create either awareness or interest. The state did, however, have a workshop during Year I of the project and the following recommendations were made relative to that workshop:

1. A workshop/training session ahead of time for the people who conducted the workshop so that they did an outstanding job would have been an improvement.

2. There should be an evaluation/accountability component six months later to ascertain just what real impact the project had back at the institutional level.

Following this workshop, the state became very involved in other priorities. The most pressing was a statewide project on accountability for teacher education graduates. This had a heavy emphasis by mandate from the state level and thus, it received the emphasis of the state association. Any other emphasis from the national level would have been relegated to a lesser priority well below this state priority. Thus, the lack of participation really had nothing to do with anything that the project itself did, but rather had to do with priority setting within the state.

In the case of State Association B, this was a very young association at the time of the beginning of the project. It was felt by the leaders of the state association that this project would be a vehicle to coalesce the institutions into a cohesive association.

There was a great deal of diversity and self-pursuit on the part of the institutions within the association at that time, and so it was hoped that this project would be a real factor in strengthening the ties of the institutions within the association. This didn't work. It was not the project's fault. It was the fault of the institutions.

The institutions had a history of getting "burned" in cooperative ventures. Thus, there was much reluctance on the part of the institutions to try it again. There was also a real coordination problem in terms of the institutions working with the public schools. This was especially important in the area of special education. Involvement between the institutions and the public schools just wasn't there and there didn't seem to be much interest on becoming involved on the part of the public schools.

Thus, in the case of this association, the hope for the project as a coalescing activity just didn't work out and probably this would have been true of any other project that they might have tried to use in this way. In the case of this association its members are going to have to get together in a more non-threatening activity first and then try a project of the scope of the AACTE/OSE project.

In the case of State C, again there was a very divisive element in terms of the relationship of the institutions to each other in the state. This had come about in the last two years as a result of some administrative changes in institutions in the state. The association, which had at one time been a rather strong association,

had lost a great deal of its effectiveness because of this leadership from key institutions of the state. While it was hoped that this project might serve as a way of helping to get the institutions back together again through the state association, it didn't work. Again, the same would probably have been true of any other project that might have come into the state and so the project itself cannot be blamed for the lack of participation on the part of this state.

In the case of State Association D, a year and a half prior to the AACTE project, the state passed legislation requiring changes in the Teacher Preparation Program for Regular Classroom Teachers. These changes had to do with the handling of mainstreaming within the regular classroom. By the time the AACTE/OSE project came along, "awareness" was not an issue in the state. They still, nevertheless, held a meeting devoted to the project and it worked to help those institutions which had not come as far as most of the institutions had in dealing with the state mandate. The remainder of the "project time" by the state association was devoted to efforts for providing information to institutions as they worked through their programs.

This state feels that this is a very viable way of doing things but AACTE must realize that states, like institutions, teachers, and children, have individualities and you work with them where they are. The AACTE must remember that if a state doesn't get involved it may be because it's already been there.

State Association E had become a relatively inactive association prior to the beginning of the project. This situation existed because of some problems of dealing with different agendas for the small as opposed to the large SCDEs in the state. With this feeling still prevailing at the beginning of the project, there was some difficulty in getting the project going. However, the project was helpful in getting the association working on a common agenda and, therefore, it was good for the association. The possibility of sharing ideas on a common problem was a very good one for the association. Because of the nature of the state association at that point, however, the involvement was not as heavy as it might have been had the association been a stronger and more active association.

It was felt that the model is an excellent model and it provides a good return for the number of dollars spent. The flexibility which is provided within this model was strongly applauded. The state officer recommended that he felt it would be very good for ACSR to provide summaries of the various approaches to the problem, somewhat like the Deans' Grants projects do for their people. This would be very helpful. It would be good to know how the various SCDEs approach common problems. The state association felt that this project had helped alot and they would hope that this kind of activity would continue.

Interviews with State Officers Heavily Involved: The president from State Association F indicated that the LTI was a high personal point for him, for it changed his attitude toward the handicapped and the need in terms of preparation of teachers for the regular classroom.

He went back to the state and got involved in the regulations which were developed for the state relative to teacher preparation programs. The state association became very involved in this activity and this served as a vehicle to bring institutions together. They needed help and this caused them to get together. When an institution or group thought they had problems unique to them, discussion through the state association showed that they all had the same problem, maybe to a different degree, but still the same problem. There was the strong realization that everyone needed to pull together. It provided the vehicle whereby institutions might do this and this spurred the state association into action.

This model is an excellent model. It's very cost efficient. With a small amount of money, a large return comes from the investment. The flexibility which the model provides, thereby allowing the state association to meet its own individuality, is an excellent part of the model.

Improvements would be to use ACSR meetings more effectively. The use of the meetings to provide substantive help to the state associations would be a great improvement. It would be helpful to pass out and discuss success stories -- how various states use different approaches to solve the same problem. ACSR should serve as a vehicle to collect and dissiminate ideas on various ways to solve problems.

State Association G became very involved in meeting the new standards for teacher preparation programs devised by the state. The state association provided ways of pooling ideas to meet the new

standards. The approach used was not to highlight the big institutions of the state but rather to highlight practices and how all institutions could utilize them. It really pulled the institutions together within the state association and it improved the working relationship between the state department and the institutions of the state.

As the institutions became more involved, the association provided lots of help through materials and workshops on "how to do it." The level of involvement was far greater than the expectations of any of the associational leaders at the beginning of the project. The outcome to the state and to the institutions in the state was "tremendous." The state association is now a much stronger association because of the way the institutions worked together through the state association on this project.

The members of this association strongly applaud this project and recommend it as a model for future activities. It's an excellent model, giving very high return on the investment.

In the case of State Association H, the state department has set up requirements for competencies for teacher education programs within the state. The state association was an excellent vehicle as a sounding board to air the various approaches to meet the state mandate. In this way, the state association provided a very valuable service for the state and the outcome was excellent.

The project was excellent for providing leadership training. The state officer indicated that he wished there could have been at least one more LTI to work further toward accomplishing this leadership development. It was felt, however, that the model is a very excellent

one and highly recommended as a future model for activities of this type within AACTE.

The officer from State Association J said that the project had provided an excellent vehicle for activity within the state association. It provided substantive activities for the state association and a cohesive element for direction within the state. The model is a very excellent one and was very helpful to this state association.

The officer from State Association J indicated that the state had been very active in working with the State Department of Education in order to establish guideline changes for teacher preparation programs to handle mainstreaming in the regular classroom. The institutions of the state would not have been able to deal as effectively with the state department had not the state association had this project. It was, therefore, strongly endorsed by the state and the model recommended for future projects of AACTE.

A number of comments were made relative to the AACTE/OSE project which are noteworthy and should be considered in an evaluation of this project. The following are illustrative of those comments:

> "I admire the AACTE leadership for developing this project. It was well developed and articulated. The three-year sequence gave it continuity and a momentum that otherwise would have not been possible."
>
> "The St. Louis and Nashville training sessions had so much in them that it took considerable time to sort out the materials and ideas. I only wish that there had been a training session at the end that condensed and arranged the steps to follow to carry out the project back in the state."
>
> "This project probably got as much mileage out of a small amount of money as it would be possible to accomplish. The model is set up in a way which provides enough flexibility for the state to provide for its own problems and concerns while dealing with a national issue. I would highly recommend it for future use of the AACTE/OSE leadership."

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A careful synthesis of the information obtained from the questionnaires and from the ten interviews provides several major findings. First, there was overwhelming support for this project as a model for utilizing the state associations and ACSR as a viable vehicle for change at the institutional and state level. This evaluation was true throughout the continuum of participation by state associations, extending from those that either participated in a very minor way to those that were very heavily involved in the AACTE/OSE project. The repeated reaction was that this was an excellent model and should be used in the future by AACTE as a way of involving IHEs through the state association.

There were several factors involved in the support of this model by the state associations. First of all, the states found this to be a very cost-efficient way of involving the state association and the institutions within the state. By utilizing a relatively small amount of money, a relatively large amount of involvement and change could be accomplished. It was felt that the LTIs used for the development of understanding and strategies on the part of state leaders is a crucial part of the process. In fact, it was recommended that for the amount of money involved it would really be worth having two LTIs with the same group of state leaders for the purpose of more highly developing the leadership capabilities of these people at the state level.

The use of the LTIs coupled with the seed money for use by the state association is an excellent combination. The flexibility provided the state in the use of the money is also an excellent part of the model. This provides the state association with the opportunity to design its activities in keeping with the needs and current level of involvement of the IHEs in the state. This was looked upon as the real strength of the project model.

A second conclusion is that there were a wide variety of outcomes from the project. These could be broken down into those outcomes that applied primarily to the institutions of higher education within the state, those which applied to states, and those which applied to state associations. In terms of IHEs, it was the ultimate goal that changes would occur here in terms of the programs for preparing teachers to handle handicapped students in the regular classroom. This goal is evidently being accomplished in varying degrees depending upon the many factors related to the institution, the situation in the state, the state association, and other variables. Basically, it would appear that these changes, however, seem to be preceding at least as well a rate as might have been hoped for and often better than might have been anticipated. Over a third of the respondents indicated that all of the institutions in their state had made changes in their teacher preparation programs. This is increased to half of the associations responding if one accepts the level of from 50 to 100% of the institutions in the state changing their program. This would have to be looked upon as a significant number of institutions changing their programs within the state within the time period provided by the project.

A wide variety of outcomes were reported for the states involved in the project. Over half of these indicated that changes had been made or were pending in the certification requirements for teachers in the state. Well over half of these changes were changes effecting regular classroom teachers and over a third affected both teachers and administrators. While smaller in number, quite a few of the states had made changes in the requirements for approval of teacher education programs by the state. The amount of legislation enacted which affected the preparation of teachers for handling handicapped students in the regular classroom was at about the same level as changes in state requirements.

The project was evaluated as a good one for many state associations. In some instances, it helped to strengthen the association and in some instances, it either helped to get a new association started or it furnished the vehicle for helping to develop a very young association.

On the less positive side, in some instances where state associations had hoped the project would provide the impetus for strengthening the association, this did not materialize. Also, the project was not uniformally successful in increasing the cooperative ventures among SCDEs within the state.

It was generally recommended that closer coordination/linkages with the state-based or state-focused national groups such as NASDTEC, NASDSE, and NASBE be established and that a greater effort be directed to regional efforts of AACTE with state associations.

A number of lesser outcomes and evaluation of the various components within the project may be gleaned from the simple presentation of data in the preceding section. Special plaudits were

voiced, however, for Mrs. Penny Earley and the AACTE staff for their support and effort, and for the Leadership Training Institute as a valuable tool in increasing the leadership capabilities of state association presidents and other officers.

One other conclusion which came through repeatedly both in the questionnaire study and the interviews was that state associations and institutions of higher education, like teachers and students, have individual personalities and differing needs and we should keep this in mind in any project of this kind. This means that the politics of a state situation or within an institution may dictate the focus of that association or institution regardless of what the priorities from a national standpoint might be. It means, also, that in some instances the state association or its institutions may be ahead of the level of participation of a national project.

As a final word, all of this seems to say that the model used by the AACTE/OSE project is an excellent one and hopefully will be continually repeated with other issues and concerns in the future. It works. However, it should be kept in mind that regardless of whatever priority may be put on the substance of the project in Washington, it may not receive that priority in each of the states. It's unlikely that any project will receive top priority in all fifty-four of the states and territories.

Dr. Mark Smith is Associate Dean of the College of Education at the University of Arizona in Tucson. Dr. Smith served as Chairman of the Advisory Council of State Representatives and as a member of the AACTE Board of Directors in 1978 and 1979.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, R. R., "In The Fullness of Time," Southern Speech Communication Journal, 45: 121-132, Winter 1980.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, AACTE State Unit Task Force Report, Washington, D.C., November 4, 1974.

_____, AACTE Task Force To Develop Principles For State (Regional) Unit Involvement in AACTE, Washington, D.C., November 1975.

_____, Institutional Capacity Building To Support P.L. 94-142: A Proposal to BEH, Washington, D.C., March 15, 1978.

_____, State Associations of Colleges for Teacher Education& Public Policy, Washington, D.C., March 1979.

_____, Your Role in ACSR: State Officers Handbook, Washington, D.C., 1980.

Bucher, Robert M. and Moore, Richard J., "Accountability for Graduate Medical Education: Report of an Unsuccessful Experiment," Journal of Medical Education, 50: 1038-1043, November 1975.

Ellena, William J., AASA: An Analysis of Structure, Purpose, Program and Services, AASA, Washington, D.C., 1971.

Kapur, J. N., "Change in Mathematical Education Since The Late 1950's -- Ideas and Realization: India," Educational Studies in Mathematics, 9: 245-253, May 1978.

Lazarfeld, Paul F. Ed., "The Utilization of Sociological Ideas in Organizational Planning," The Multi-Disciplinary Graduate Program in Educational Research, Final Report, Part IV, Learning Research Development Center, University of Pittsburgh, March 1975.

Liddell, Marian Beth, AACTE State Associations and Public Law 94-142, AACTE, Washington, D.C., January 1981.

Morrison, Deanna M., A Research Paper on the Status of Law-Focused Education in the United States, 1978-1979, 1979.

National Education Association, Instructional Innovation and The Local Association. Washington, D.C., March 1973.

Pierce, Truman, Crises in Teacher Education: A Dynamic Response To AACTE's Future Role. AACTE, Washington, D.C., January 1971.

Vogt, Thomas, Ed., Five Levels of Imcompetence. Higher Education, Teaching, and The Education of Teachers. Report of The Grove Park Institute, Consortium of Professional Associations for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs, Washington, D.C., July 1970.